Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive

DSpace Repository

Theses and Dissertations | 1. Thesis and Dissertation Collection, all items

2002-06

NATO's crisis management in the Balkans

Johnson, Jennifer L.

Monterey, California. Naval Postgraduate School

http://hdl.handle.net/10945/3016

This publication is a work of the U.S. Government as defined in Title 17, United States Code, Section 101. Copyright protection is not available for this work in the United States.

Downloaded from NPS Archive: Calhoun

http://www.nps.edu/library

Calhoun is the Naval Postgraduate School's public access digital repository for research materials and institutional publications created by the NPS community. Calhoun is named for Professor of Mathematics Guy K. Calhoun, NPS's first appointed -- and published -- scholarly author.

Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle
Monterey, California USA 93943

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
Monterey, California

THESIS

NATO'S CRISIS MANAGEMENT IN THE BALKANS

by

Jennifer L. Johnson

June 2002

Thesis Advisor:	David S. Yost
Second Reader:	Tjarck Roessler

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.			
1. AGENCY USE ONLY *(Leave blank)*	**2. REPORT DATE** June 2002	**3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED** Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE: Title (Mix case letters) NATO's Crisis Management in the Balkans			**5. FUNDING NUMBERS**
6. AUTHOR(S) Jennifer L. Johnson			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000			**8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER**
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A			**10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER**
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.			
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited			**12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE**

13. ABSTRACT ***(maximum 200 words)***

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) forces are currently deployed in three Balkan states: Bosnia-Herzegovina; Yugoslavia, in the province of Kosovo; and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM). These three deployments represent NATO's attempts to date to conduct crisis management operations, a mission the Alliance adopted in the early 1990s and now a fundamental security task alongside collective defense. In view of the increasing importance of crisis management in NATO activities, this thesis analyzes the Balkan operations to identify lessons that can be applied to future doctrines. NATO's 1991 and 1999 Strategic Concepts are reviewed to illustrate the development of NATO's crisis management doctrine. Each Balkan intervention is examined to clarify NATO's crisis management failures and successes, and to assess apparent lessons. The thesis compares the lessons learned with the crisis management doctrine contained in the 2001 *NATO Handbook*, and offers recommendations for revisions to take fuller account of the lessons learned in the Balkans.

14. SUBJECT TERMS NATO, Crisis management, Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY), Bosnia-Herzegovina, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM)			**15. NUMBER OF PAGES** 51
			16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	**18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE** Unclassified	**19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT** Unclassified	**20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT** UL

NSN 7540-01-280-5500 Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. 239-18

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

NATO'S CRISIS MANAGEMENT IN THE BALKANS

Jennifer L. Johnson
Lieutenant, United States Navy
B.S., United States Naval Academy, 1996

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
June 2002

Author: Jennifer L. Johnson

Approved by: David S. Yost
Thesis Advisor

Tjarck Roessler
Second Reader

James J. Wirtz
Chairman, Department of National Security Affairs

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) forces are currently deployed in three Balkan states: Bosnia-Herzegovina; Yugoslavia, in the province of Kosovo; and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM). These three deployments represent NATO's attempts to date to conduct crisis management operations, a mission the Alliance adopted in the early 1990s and now a fundamental security task alongside collective defense. In view of the increasing importance of crisis management in NATO activities, this thesis analyzes the Balkan operations to identify lessons that can be applied to future doctrines. NATO's 1991 and 1999 Strategic Concepts are reviewed to illustrate the development of NATO's crisis management doctrine. Each Balkan intervention is examined to clarify NATO's crisis management failures and successes, and to assess apparent lessons. The thesis compares the lessons learned with the crisis management doctrine contained in the 2001 *NATO Handbook*, and offers recommendations for revisions to take fuller account of the lessons learned in the Balkans.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. NATO'S CRISIS MANAGEMENT DOCTRINES 5
- A. 1991 STRATEGIC CONCEPT 5
- B. 1999 STRATEGIC CONCEPT 7

III. NATO IN BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA 11
- A. HISTORY OF THE CONFLICT 11
- B. NATO'S INTERVENTION 12
- C. THE END STATE 15
- D. LESSONS TO BE LEARNED 16

IV. NATO IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA 19
- A. HISTORY OF THE CONFLICT 19
- B. NATO'S INTERVENTION 19
- C. THE END STATE 21
- D. LESSONS TO BE LEARNED 23

V. NATO IN THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA 27
- A. HISTORY OF THE CONFLICT 27
- B. NATO'S INTERVENTION 28
- C. THE END STATE 29
- D. LESSONS BEING LEARNED 30

VI. CONCLUSION 33

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST 39

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank Professor David Yost for his invaluable assistance in the development of the ideas in this thesis and his endless patience in editing. She also wishes to thank Colonel Tjarck Roessler for his many contributions both to this thesis and her academic career at the Naval Postgraduate School, and Professor Stephen Garrett for first introducing her to this subject through a fascinating class.

Finally, the author would also like to thank her parents, for always believing in her, and her husband, Steven, for always listening and providing unending support.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I. INTRODUCTION

Although the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was established in 1949, the first use of deadly force by the Alliance did not occur until 28 February 1994, when NATO aircraft patrolling the United Nations Security Council (UNSC)-imposed no-fly zone over Bosnia-Herzegovina shot down two Bosnian Serb aircraft. Since 1992, when NATO first undertook no-fly zone and embargo enforcement missions, NATO operations have been almost entirely focused on crisis management—so-called "non-Article 5 missions"—and conducted in the Balkans. At present, NATO troops—joined by some non-NATO forces—are conducting such missions in three non-NATO nations: the Stabilization Force (SFOR) is in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Kosovo Force (KFOR) in the Kosovo province of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY), and the troops in OPERATION AMBER FOX in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM). The forces in FYROM represent NATO's third attempt at crisis management in the Balkans. In the cases of SFOR and KFOR—and increasingly AMBER FOX—none of the missions appears likely to conclude in the foreseeable future.

An indicator of the importance attached to crisis management may be found in a review of the 2001 *NATO Handbook*. A word search finds that the phrase "crisis management" is used 121 times, while the phrase "collective defence" appears only 32 times. While the latter was still presented as a key element of NATO's existence, it was the former which took much of the focus.

When NATO invoked Article 5 after the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States, it appeared possible that the Alliance would shift its focus back to collective defense. However, the operations in Afghanistan to date—with non-native military operations almost entirely conducted by U.S. forces, while NATO member states have provided mostly political and intelligence support[1]—and the continuing NATO

[1] The main exception to this has been the United Kingdom, which has provided troops on the ground, such as the Marine detachment at Bagram airbase and special forces, and strike support with cruise missile launches, surveillance, and refueling. See CNN.com, "UK Troops Set to Be Stood Down," 26 November 2001, <http://www.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/europe/11/26/gen.britain.troops1000/index.html> and CNN.com, "British Ground Troops on Standby," 26 October 2001, <http://www.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/europe/10/25/ret.british.troops/index.html>.

commitment in the Balkans indicate that crisis management in southeastern Europe will remain a major mission for the Alliance for some time to come. NATO's Secretary General, Lord George Robertson, acknowledged this in February 2002 when he said that NATO "has a vital role - in my view the vital role - to play in multinational crisis prevention and crisis management."[2] In fact, a major point of the Secretary General's speech was that better crisis prevention and crisis management could preclude the emergence of collective defense challenges such as terrorism, as demonstrated in practical terms by the destruction of Al-Qaida cells in the Balkans.[3]

This thesis analyzes NATO's operations in the Balkans and their respective outcomes in light of the following question: What lessons can be learned from NATO's operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and what implications do they have for NATO's future crisis management doctrine?

This thesis identifies the lessons that can be drawn from the outcomes of the various NATO operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the FRY, and FYROM. Each intervention was conducted for the purpose of crisis management, yet each operation was different, with divergent outcomes. The changes from one operation to the next, most notably the differences in OPERATIONS ESSENTIAL HARVEST and AMBER FOX in FYROM as compared to the earlier interventions in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the FRY, suggests that a learning process within NATO has already taken place. This thesis examines NATO's principal Balkan operations to cull possible lessons from them and thereby, it is hoped, contribute to the development of NATO's crisis management doctrine.

The second chapter provides an overview of NATO's crisis management doctrines during the operations in the Balkans. The Alliance's 1991 Strategic Concept, written to address the changing security environment in Europe following the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, indicated the original shift in focus from traditional Communist bloc-oriented collective defense to risks that were "multi-faceted in nature and multi-

[2] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO's Future: Speech by NATO's Secretary General, Lord Robertson. 4 February 2002. 6 February 2002. <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s020203a.htm>.

[3] Ibid.

directional." These risks were more likely to come from the "adverse consequences of instabilities that may arise from the serious economic, social and political difficulties, including ethnic rivalries and territorial disputes," that many countries in Central and Eastern Europe were facing.[4] The 1999 Strategic Concept elevated the relative importance of the crisis management mission, listing it as a "fundamental task" to achieve the "essential purpose" of the Alliance.[5]

The following three chapters consist of case studies of the NATO operations in the Balkans: Bosnia-Herzegovina in chapter III; the FRY in chapter IV; and FYROM in chapter V. The NATO operations in each country are outlined and analyzed. The conduct of operations is compared to the doctrine of crisis management prevailing at the time of the intervention, and the outcomes are compared to the stated objectives to determine how well the latter were met. From this analysis, lessons are drawn as to the effectiveness of specific approaches to crisis management.

The sixth chapter assesses the future of crisis management in NATO in light of the lessons from the Balkan operations. NATO's view of crisis management, most recently delineated in the 2001 *NATO Handbook*, is reviewed and compared to the lessons learned from Bosnia-Herzegovina, FRY, and FYROM. Where there are mismatches, this thesis recommends changes for NATO's future crisis management doctrine.

---

[4] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The Alliance's Strategic Concept agreed by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council. 10 July 2000. 4 February 2002. <http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/b911108a.htm>, paragraph 8, 9.

[5] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The Alliance's Strategic Concept approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council (Washington, D.C., 23-24 April 1999). 24 April 1999. 6 February 2002. < http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-065e.htm>, paragraph 10.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

II. NATO'S CRISIS MANAGEMENT DOCTRINES

When the Soviet Union dissolved in 1991, some analysts began to question the viability of NATO. With no obvious enemy to defend against, what need was there for a collective defense organization of this magnitude? The member states of NATO were also looking for the answer to that question, for a reason to support the continuing necessity of the Alliance.

A. 1991 STRATEGIC CONCEPT

Their initial answer was NATO's 1991 Strategic Concept, which opened with the recognition by all member heads of state and government that the Alliance needed to be transformed "to reflect the new, more promising, era in Europe."[6] However, while the end of the "political division of Europe" removed the largest threat to NATO member states, it also left the Alliance in a security environment that was much less predictable and potentially more dangerous.[7] Potential risks to the member states were difficult to predict and assess, and less likely to come from calculated aggression than from instability—due to "the serious economic, social and political difficulties, including ethnic rivalries and territorial disputes"—in Central and Eastern Europe.[8]

The collective defense mission remained paramount, the only objective listed as the purpose of the Alliance in the 1991 Strategic Concept.[9] The concern of NATO was the possibility of crises involving outside powers in Europe endangering the security of the entire continent or spilling over into member states.[10] As a result, one of the fundamental tasks of the Alliance was "to provide…a stable security environment in Europe…in which no country would be able to intimidate or coerce any European nation."[11] It was for these specific situations—where the security of the Alliance was

6 North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The Alliance's Strategic Concept agreed by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council (Rome, 7-8 November 1991). 10 July 2000. <http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/b911108a.htm>, intro., paragraph 1.

7 7-8 November 1991, paragraph 1.

8 7-8 November 1991, paragraph 8, 9.

9 7-8 November 1991, paragraph 15.

10 7-8 November, 1991, paragraph 9.

11 7-8 November, 1991, paragraph 20i.

threatened either directly or through a threat to all of Europe—that NATO introduced the mission of crisis management.[12]

Crisis management in the 1991 Strategic Concept included preventive diplomacy and "appropriate...measures as required from a range of political and other measures, including those in the military field," to resolve crises at the earliest possible stage.[13] The focus was largely on dialogue and cooperation, to reduce the possibility of misunderstandings growing into conflicts, and on working within the framework of other international organizations, including the CSCE, the European Community, the Western European Union, and the UN.[14] Exactly what those appropriate measures could or should be was not definitively stated, nor were specific force requirements given.[15] The emphasis for force structure remained on the ability to deter or repulse an attack on a NATO member, but the role of the military was expanded to include contributing to the stability of Europe and ensuring that peace was preserved. Again, this largely meant dialogue with the militaries of other states and cooperation in joint exercises, but it also included the possibility of taking part in UN missions.[16] Other than specifying the mobility and flexibility to react and deploy in a timely manner to respond to crises, the majority of the directives given regarding force structure focused on the primary mission of the Alliance rather than crisis management.[17]

Less than a year after the 1991 Strategic Concept was released, NATO was operating in the former Yugoslavia in support of economic sanctions and the arms embargo. The much-touted shift in focus was not matched by a shift in capabilities and

---

[12] The phrase "crisis management" was used by NATO during the Cold War, but was applied above all to Article 5 missions of collective defense. "It signified NATO's intention to bring any eventual violent confrontation with the Warsaw Pact to a conclusion as rapidly as possible, with a minimum of armed combat and destructive use of force." See David Yost, NATO Transformed: The Alliance's New Roles in International Security (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2000) 189.

[13] 7-8 November, 1991, paragraph 32-33.

[14] 7-8 November, 1991, paragraph, 25, 33. In November 1993, with the entry into force of that Maastricht Treaty, the European Community became the European Union (EU). In December 1994, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe became the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

[15] 7-8 November, 1991, paragraph 40.

[16] 7-8 November, 1991, paragraph 41. It should be noted that this paragraph is numbered 42 in some published versions of the 1991 Strategic Concept.

[17] 7-8 November, 1991, paragraph 44-53.

framework to meet these new obligations, and the Allies disagreed about whether the crisis in Bosnia-Herzegovina could be categorized as a threat to greater European security or a specific NATO member state. As a result, there was no consensus on when or how to act, and from 1991 through 1995, arguments over Bosnia-Herzegovina added to the strain across the Atlantic within the Alliance. The Alliance nonetheless became more involved in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and on February 28, 1994, NATO used deadly force for the first time, shooting down two Bosnian Serb aircraft violating the United Nations (UN) no-fly zone.[18] In August 1995, Operation Deliberate Force was launched in Bosnia-Herzegovina, leading to the Dayton Peace Accords. The NATO-led Implementation Force (IFOR) conducted its mission for the prescribed year, followed by the Stabilization Force (SFOR).

B. 1999 STRATEGIC CONCEPT

Less than four years after the conclusion of the Dayton agreement in November 1995, NATO aircraft were again in the skies of the former Yugoslavia. The Rambouillet peace negotiations had failed, and this time the Alliance was hitting targets in the FRY, including Kosovo, as part of Operation Allied Force. During the seventy-eight day bombing campaign in March – June 1999, NATO issued its 1999 Strategic Concept. The shift in focus from collective defense to crisis management missions was more pronounced, and the Balkans were specifically mentioned as an example of the type of crisis the Alliance could expect to face and needed to be able to deal with.[19]

In the 1991 Strategic Concept references to crisis management were sparse. The phrase occurred only four times in the document, and "Management of Crisis and Conflict Prevention" was the last of five topics listed under "A Broad Approach to Security."[20] In contrast, crisis management was explicitly listed in the 1999 version as a fundamental task for enhancing "the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area."[21]

---

[18] Yost, 193, 195.

[19] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The Alliance's Strategic Concept approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council (Washington, D.C., 23-24 April 1999). 24 April 1999. <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-065e.htm>.

[20] The Alliance's Strategic Concept (Rome, 7-8 November 1991), paragraph 31-33.

[21] 7-8 November 1991, paragraph 10.

In April 1999 NATO made clear why it considered intervention in Bosnia and Kosovo to be both necessary and in the Alliance's interests:

> Ethnic and religious rivalries, territorial disputes, inadequate or failed efforts at reform, the abuse of human rights, and the dissolution of states can lead to local and even regional instability. The resulting tensions could lead to crises affecting Euro-Atlantic stability, to human suffering, and to armed conflicts. Such conflicts could affect the security of the Alliance by spilling over into neighbouring countries, including NATO countries, or in other ways, and could also affect the security of other states.[22]

In the 1991 Strategic Concept crisis management was addressed mostly in reference to Article 4 of the Washington Treaty, regarding consultation between the member states when their security was threatened. The 1999 Strategic Concept introduced for the first time the idea of crisis management in accordance with Article 7, which recognized the primary responsibility of the UN Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.[23] The importance of other European security institutions and the UN was reiterated.[24]

The key difference between the Strategic Concepts of 1991 and 1999 was that in the latter military intervention played a greater role alongside the concepts of dialogue and cooperation for the prevention and management of crises. Immediately after the necessity for capabilities to conduct collective defense, the need for forces capable of conducting conflict prevention and crisis management operations "under the full range of foreseeable circumstances" was asserted.[25] These military operations were envisioned in accordance with the offer made by NATO in 1994 to support UN Security Council or OSCE operations on a case-by-case basis.[26] Early intervention was also emphasized, in order to keep crises from developing into conflicts or, if that was not possible, to at least keep the conflicts at a distance from NATO member states. For such intervention and for peacekeeping or humanitarian emergency missions, the need for diverse military

---

[22] 24 April 1999, paragraph 20.

[23] 24 April 1999, paragraph 10. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The North Atlantic Treaty (Washington D.C, 4 April 1949). 03 May 2002. < http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/treaty.htm>.

[24] The Alliance's Strategic Concept (Washington D.C., 23-24 April 1999), paragraph 14.

[25] 24 April 1999, paragraph 29.

[26] 24 April 1999, paragraph 31.

capabilities at various levels of readiness was emphasized.[27] Cooperation and partnership still played an important role in NATO's Strategic Concept, but the emphasis had shifted from dialogue to avoid misunderstandings to joint military operations with Partnership for Peace countries.[28] Crisis management beyond the immediate borders of NATO territory, early intervention, and the option of military intervention if dialogue failed provided the cornerstones of NATO's updated Strategic Concept.

[27] 24 April 1999, paragraph 48-9.

[28] 24 April 1999, paragraph 53c.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

III. NATO IN BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA

A. HISTORY OF THE CONFLICT

On April 6, 1992, the European Community recognized Bosnia-Herzegovina as an independent state. Officially, the war in Bosnia dates from the day of recognition, but fighting had been going on for more than a week.[29] Bosnian Serb forces, supplemented with remnants of the Yugoslav army and supported by the government in Belgrade, began working to control as much of Bosnia as they could in the hopes of "ethnically cleansing" the territory of Bosnian Muslims and Croats. Various Bosnian Croat factions, seeing the writing on the wall, moved to seize as much territory as they could with the overt approval of the government of Croatia. In between were the outmatched and under-armed Bosniaks.[30]

Without a patron and deprived of military equipment by the UN arms embargo, the Bosniaks had no chance to correct their military deficiencies. One of the reasons for the reluctance of the major European powers to allow more arms into the area was a complete misjudgment of the conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Western politicians referred to the conflict as a "civil war," and implied that all parties were equally at fault.[31] The European Community had monitors in the country, but the UN refused to dispatch peacekeepers when Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic requested them.[32] In mid-April 1991, Izetbegovic requested NATO air strikes against the Serbian aggressors; it was not until the next year that NATO became involved, and then it was to assist in enforcing the arms embargo.[33]

---

[29] Noel Malcolm, Bosnia: A Short History (New York: New York UP, 1996) 234-5.

[30] "Bosniak" is sometimes used to describe the nationality of the non-Serb and non-Croat citizens in Bosnia-Herzegovina, both to avoid the religious connotations the label "Muslim" gives to Western readers (and which is not characteristic of the population) and to avoid the inconsistency caused by not also referring to Croats as "Catholics" and Serbs as "Orthodox." See Yost, 376, n. 15.

[31] Ibid, 238-9, 242-3.

[32] Warren Zimmermann, Origins of a Catastrophe: Yugoslavia and its Destroyers (New York: Times Books, 1999) 172. UN negotiator Cyrus Vance, focused on the need for a peacekeeping force in Croatia in mid-1991, explained to Zimmermann that "peacekeepers are used after a conflict, not before."

[33] Ibid, 197.

By the end of 1992, NATO was enforcing the economic sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro, patrolling and enforcing the no-fly zone, delivering humanitarian supplies, supporting the arms embargo against the former Yugoslavia as a whole, providing close air support for UNPROFOR, and conducting limited air strikes; these were NATO's principal actions in Bosnia-Herzegovina until August 1995.[34] In the meantime, the UN Security Council had responded in June 1992 to Izetbegovic's request for peacekeepers by authorizing the UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR).[35] These troops were assigned to assist in the delivery of aid, but beyond that, their mission was unclear.[36] Although UNPROFOR's actions helped to avert an even greater humanitarian disaster in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the troops proved to be more liability than asset when hundreds were taken hostage by Bosnian Serb forces.[37] The UN's establishment of the so-called "safe areas" was another failure, as was shown most brutally at Srebrenica, where thousands of Bosnian Muslim men were slaughtered by Bosnian Serb forces.

The main diplomatic effort before NATO intervention in Bosnia-Herzegovina was the Vance-Owen plan developed by negotiators from the EC and the UN. The plan called for several cantons based on ethnic populations. While it stipulated that refugees be allowed to return and organized the Serbian territory in such a way that it could not be joined in a Serb republic, it managed to alienate all parties by seeming to reward ethnic cleansing (the Muslim and Croat view), but not enough (the Serb view).[38] With such strong and universal rejection, no military mission to enforce it was feasible.[39]

B. NATO'S INTERVENTION

As early as 1992, Warren Zimmermann, the last U.S. ambassador to Yugoslavia, was pushing hard for NATO air strikes. He was a proponent of limited strikes focusing on the elimination of Serbian military installations, equipment, and supply routes. The

---

[34] Yost, 193-4.

[35] The International Institute for Strategic Studies, The Military Balance 1995-1996 (London: Oxford UP, 1995) 303.

[36] Malcolm, 247.

[37] Ivo H. Daalder, Getting to Dayton (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2000) 41.

[38] Malcolm, 247-8.

[39] William Pfaff. "Invitation To War." Foreign Affairs 72.3 (Summer 1993) <http://proquest.umi.com/aqdweb?TS=978734714&RQT=309&CC=1&Dtp=1&Did=000000000414790&Mtd=2&>.

goal was to make credible the threat of force and provide an incentive to the Serbs to come to the negotiating table.[40] Other analysts were arguing that only NATO had the credibility to guarantee the borders of Central and Eastern European countries—thereby reducing the incentive for Serbian and Croatian advances in Bosnia-Herzegovina—and that the Alliance should be deployed with a strong mandate to fight if necessary.[41]

It was not until August 1993 that all the allies agreed on the necessity of threatening and, if necessary, conducting NATO air strikes. However, reaching that agreement required sharing the decision on conducting strikes with the UN, the "dual key" arrangement.[42] It was nearly six months and an artillery shell in a Sarajevo marketplace later before strikes were even threatened. The threat worked--Serb forces ended the siege of Sarajevo.[43] At the end of 1994, unfortunately, the results were not as good. Air strikes on Serbian assets involved in the assault of Bihac, another "safe area," and threats of more to come not only did not deter the Serbs; they led to the first detention of UN peacekeepers and observers. Allies with vulnerable UNPROFOR troops rejected further strikes to answer the Serb action.[44] The next round of hostage taking by the Serb forces in May 1995 led the UN to refuse to conduct any more strikes. The longer NATO failed to take decisive action, the louder questions on NATO's credibility became—even from members. William Perry, then-U.S. Secretary of Defense, assessed NATO thus in 1995: "Paralyzed into inaction, NATO seemed to be irrelevant in dealing with the Bosnian crisis...It appeared to me that NATO was in the process of unraveling."[45]

It took a strong push from the United States to finally break the UN/NATO impasse in July 1995. Serb forces had taken many of the eastern "safe areas" and had announced that they would finish the war by autumn.[46] Agreement was reached in July

---

[40] Zimmermann, 214-5.

[41] Pfaff, 97.

[42] Daalder, 21-2.

[43] Ibid, 25-6.

[44] Ibid, 32-3.

[45] Perry quoted in Sean Kay, NATO and the Future of European Security (New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1998) 80.

[46] Ibid, 67-8.

between the allies and the UN that an attack, or preparation for an attack, on the "safe area" of Gorazde would result in massive air strikes not only in the vicinity but against Serb forces throughout Bosnia-Herzegovina. More importantly, the responsibility for approving air strikes in defense of forces on the ground would rest with the ground commander, not the UN Secretary General or his representative. Potential targets were identified and prioritized: Option 1 targets were air defense systems and Bosnian Serb forces in the field; Option 2 targets were command-and-control facilities, supply and munitions sites, radars and missile sites, and force concentrations; and Option 3 targets were dual-use infrastructures. Lastly, the taking of UN hostages would not result in a cease-fire.[47]

On 28 August 1995, Serb forces shelled Sarajevo once again. Two days later, NATO responded with Operation Deliberate Force. Over 3,000 sorties were flown by the end of the operation on 14 September 1995. At the same time, the Muslim and Croatian forces were able to take advantage of the disarray of the Serbian forces and conducted offensives for their biggest gains of the war. The ratio of territory controlled by the Serbs and the Muslims/Croats respectively shifted from 70/30 to almost 50/50.[48] These operations brought Belgrade to the negotiating table as the representative of the Bosnian Serbs.

The result of these negotiations was the Dayton Peace Accords, which gave fifty-one percent of the country to the Muslim-Croat Federation and forty-nine percent to the Republika Sprska. Neither side was pleased with the outcome—one Bosnian Serb representative reportedly fainted at the sight of the final map—but neither side had a choice.[49] Milosevic represented the Bosnian Serbs, since the negotiators refused to deal with their leaders directly, and Milosevic was willing to sign away quite a bit to get the sanctions on the FRY lifted. The Muslims, on the other hand, were told that they could

---

[47] Ibid, 75-9.

[48] Ibid, 124, 130-1.

[49] Warren Bass. "The Triage of Dayton." Foreign Affairs 77.5 (September/October 1998) <http://firstsearch.oclc.org/WebZ/FTFETCH?sessionid=sp02sw05-58670-chmgievq-qakcf2:entitypagenum=>.

take it or leave it, and since leaving it meant losing their benefactor—NATO—they signed.[50]

C. THE END STATE

IFOR officially took authority from UNPROFOR on 20 December 1995, bringing in 60,000 troops for one year to implement the military aspects of the Dayton Peace Accords. Its mission was to end hostilities, separate the armed forces, reshape internal boundaries, and move forces and heavy equipment to designated storage sites. IFOR was declared a success only six months in to the mission. Yet, one year after IFOR arrived, it was replaced by SFOR; why, if IFOR's mission was complete?[51]

SFOR, with 19,000 troops as of May 2002, has a different mission: providing increased levels of support to civilian organizations operating in Bosnia-Herzegovina by giving them a safe and secure environment in which to work.[52] Perhaps the key difference between the two forces is that IFOR's mission was to implement the Dayton peace agreement, while SFOR's mission includes not only preventing a resumption of hostilities and promoting a peaceful climate, but also providing an increasing level of support to civilian organizations.[53] SFOR was meant to operate until June 1998, but well before that time it was recognized that a longer stay would be necessary to build a lasting peace; the mandate has been extended indefinitely.[54]

While IFOR did handle the military aspects of the Dayton agreement as assigned, those formed only the beginning of a lasting peace plan. It is the non-military aspects--civil, economic, and political--that are needed to build a strong state, and these are the ones not being implemented for the most part.[55] Perhaps the most glaring deficiency is the poor record on arrests of indicted war criminals. Concern over the detrimental effect

---

[50] Daalder, 137.

[51] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Bosnia and Herzegovina - Facts and Figures. 8 March 2001. 31 October 2001. <http://www.nato.int/docu/facts/2000/bih-fnf.htm>.

[52] Ibid. NATO plans to cut to the number of troops even further, to 12,000; no date has been set. See CNN.com, "NATO to Cut Balkans Peacekeepers," 10 May 2002, < http://www.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/europe/05/10/nato.balkans/index.html>.

[53] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO's Role in Bosnia and Herzegovina. 8 May 2001. 31 October 2001. <http://www.nato.int/docu/facts/2000/role-bih.htm>.

[54] Yost, 195, 218.

[55] Ibid, 200.

of SFOR casualties has allowed the worst inciters of violence—Radovan Karadzic, the former Bosnian Serb political leader, and Ratko Mladic, the former Bosnian Serb military commander, are two of the most commonly mentioned—to walk free and continue to block necessary reforms and healing.[56] Until these aspects are dealt with, an atmosphere of distrust, fear, and hatred will prevail, and NATO troops will continue to be needed in SFOR.

D. LESSONS TO BE LEARNED

The first of the lessons that can be drawn from the NATO experience in Bosnia is the simple fact that U.S. leadership in NATO is essential. When U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher traveled to Europe to present the lift-and-strike plan while in a "'listening mode,'" the allies were appalled at the apparent unwillingness of the United States to take the lead.[57] For a time, the United States operated under the belief that it had to choose between NATO and Bosnia, and the Alliance was more important; to save NATO, it was argued, America had to stop pushing to use it. In contrast, when the United States took the initiative in August 1995, it got the agreement it wanted that eventually led to Operation Deliberate Force, and the Europeans were relieved even if they did not like all aspects of the plan.[58]

This lack of direction led to the second lesson from Bosnia-Herzegovina—the importance of NATO intervening on its own terms. In the case of Bosnia, the United States was pushed by the realization that UNPROFOR was close to being declared a failure, resulting in a withdrawal covered in part by U.S. troops. There was disagreement among U.S. officials as to how automatic the U.S. military participation was in NATO OPLAN 40104, the operation to cover UNPROFOR's retreat, and who did or did not know about it in detail. However, the fact remained that the time was rapidly approaching when the United States was going to run the risk of leaving its allies uncovered—likely a disastrous blow for the alliance.[59] NATO had to act or be forced into a worse position.

---

[56] Ibid, 222-3.

[57] Daalder, 16.

[58] Ibid, 114.

[59] Ibid, 46-8, 56-9.

A third lesson can be drawn from the interactions among the various international organizations. From 1991 to 1995, a concerted effort was launched to "interlock" various international institutions to provide collective security in Europe. However, despite the considerable activity that took place, the UN, the EU, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (the CSCE, subsequently the OSCE), and NATO proved unable to prevent war in Bosnia-Herzegovina.[60] In June 1992, NATO foreign ministers announced their readiness to participate in peacekeeping missions with the CSCE on a case-by-case basis; in December of that year that pledge was extended to UN-sponsored peacekeeping missions.[61] Despite this, the "interlocking" institutions proved at best excuses for inaction and at worst obstacles to dealing with the situation in Bosnia.[62] UN-NATO relations especially appeared to have taken on the appearance of "interblocking institutions."[63] The "dual key" arrangement, requiring approval through two separate organizational structures, was widely regarded as a complete failure. It was intended to enhance the legitimacy of any use of force by NATO, but functioned to block constructive action by the Alliance.

There were two lessons to be drawn from the negotiations. First, if the parties directly involved are not the ones who are doing the negotiating, they will have no incentive to meet the agreed-upon terms. That can be seen with the Bosnian Serbs, who felt Milosevic sold them out; it was not their agreement. The negotiators at Dayton had good reason for choosing to deal with Milosevic—the Bosnian Serb leaders were indicted war criminals, and Milosevic had a greater incentive to work with NATO—but in the long term, it may prove a block to implementation. Second, forcing unwilling parties—the Bosniaks—to sign an agreement they did not agree with may have the same effect. Although some Bosniaks have acknowledged that it was probably the best deal they could get, there was bound to be resentment at being forced into a position of signing or being abandoned.

---

[60] Kay, 5.

[61] North Atlantic Treaty Organization, The NATO Handbook: 50th Anniversary Edition (Brussels, Belgium: Office of Information and Press, 1999) 113.

[62] Kay, 76.

[63] Yost, 194.

Lastly, the uncertain future of SFOR is a clear warning. It is anyone's guess how long SFOR ought to remain in Bosnia; the answer—until there is an atmosphere of trust and security—is true but not helpful. That is not to say that the solution is a firm exit date. Such operations cannot be done in, for example, a year. They are long-term missions that may take generations. NATO troops—and the member states—need to be prepared for that. Since the Alliance has pinned its credibility and continued utility on the success in Bosnia-Herzegovina, it must be willing to see this mission through to the end. The ongoing mission in Bosnia still affects the utility, credibility, and viability of NATO. Failure of SFOR could have grave implications for all three.

IV. NATO IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

A. HISTORY OF THE CONFLICT

Whereas the European powers were wrong to view the conflict in Bosnia as a civil war spinning out of control, they were equally wrong to see the situation in Kosovo as simply the oppression of an innocent minority by a brutal tyrant. Few deny the brutality of some of the Serbian forces in the province, or that many innocent ethnic Albanians suffered or were killed. However, not all the Kosovo Albanians were innocent. Some were members of the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA), and they intentionally picked a fight starting in 1996. The first two months of 1998 saw almost three quarters as many attacks as the previous two years combined.[64] The KLA continued to attack until the Serbian forces finally snapped and overreacted. On 28 February 1998, Serbian police murdered thirteen civilians after a fruitless firefight with the KLA.[65]

Added to the cycle of action/overreaction were steadily increasing threats of action by NATO if Milosevic did not rein in his Serb forces. Plans were developed in June 1998, followed by an aerial demonstration over Albania and Macedonia; neither had an effect.[66] UN Security Council resolutions demanding that the fighting stop and the talking start were likewise ignored.[67] At the same time, there was no Security Council resolution authorizing NATO to use force inside a sovereign state, so for all their bluster, the hands of the Allies were tied.[68] The situation on the ground was worsening and being broadcast around the world, increasing the pressure on the Alliance to do something.[69]

B. NATO'S INTERVENTION

The key step to NATO intervention was the agreement by the Allies that the Alliance had all of the authority from the UNSC that it needed. It was agreed that NATO

---

64 Tim Judah, Kosovo: War and Revenge (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale UP, 2000) 137.

65 Ibid, 138-9.

66 Ibid, 165.

67 Ibid, 178.

68 Ibid, 179-80.

69 Ibid, 171.

could act to stop a catastrophe in the making if Milosevic failed to abide by UN Security Council Resolution 1199.[70] With winter approaching, and a large number of displaced people living in the hills, NATO approved the plan for Operation Allied Force; this threat was credible enough to force Milosevic to back down. A cease-fire was declared and negotiations started. Serbian military and police forces in Kosovo were reduced, monitored by international verifiers.[71] Unfortunately, the KLA forces were not part of the deal for the cease-fire, and they used the time to reoccupy areas evacuated by the Serbs and to prepare for another fight.[72]

On 8 January 1999, the KLA effectively picked another fight with Serbian forces, who replied with the massacre at Racak, where forty-five ethnic Albanian civilians were killed. In response, NATO issued another threat to use force against both sides if negotiations were not completed, and then summoned the combatants to Rambouillet.[73] The Allies were confident that the continuing threat of air strikes would result in acceptance of the peace deal. However, in the view of some, there were no negotiations at Rambouillet, only ultimatums issued with threats. Additionally, the negotiators were accused—and not just by the Serbs—of having taken the KLA's side from the start.[74] However, the Kosovar Albanians were not handed their wish list to sign. They were given the same choice the Bosniaks had been given in November 1995: "'Sign or die.'"[75] The Serbs remained silent while the Kosovar Albanians argued politely, and both sides seemed to be waiting for the other to be the cause of a failure.[76] Neither side signed at that meeting, but when they reconvened about a month later, on 15 March 1999, the Kosovar Albanians were the only ones to sign.[77]

---

[70] Ibid, 184.

[71] Ibid, 185-6.

[72] Christopher Layne, "Miscalculations and Blunders Lead to War," NATO's Empty Victory: A Postmortem on the Balkan War, ed. Ted Galen Carpenter (Washington, D.C.: Cato Institute, 2000) 13-4.

[73] Judah, 195.

[74] Layne, 11, 15.

[75] Judah, 197, 200.

[76] Ibid, 208-9.

[77] Ibid, 222-4.

One last meeting was held with Milosevic on 22 March 1999, to try to get his agreement by ensuring that he understood that the threat of NATO air strikes was genuine. He understood but refused to agree. Two days later, Operation Allied Force began.[78] Although many NATO officials believed that the campaign would be short, it lasted seventy-eight days before Milosevic capitulated.[79] Two operations were to be conducted simultaneously: the Phased Air Operation, focused on air defense systems and enemy forces in Kosovo; and the Limited Air Operations, with authority to strike headquarters, forces, and facilities supporting the Serbian troops operating in Kosovo.[80] Restrictions placed on allied pilots, such as flying above 15,000 feet to limit the risk of casualties, greatly degraded their ability to hit troops on the move, so support facilities received most of the attention once the air defense systems were as degraded as possible.[81]

C. THE END STATE

There are currently 38,000 troops in Kosovo—down from the original 46,000 in June 1999—as part of KFOR, with the responsibility for preventing renewed hostilities in Kosovo, creating a safe and secure environment, demilitarizing the KLA, supporting the humanitarian effort, and supporting the UN Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo. KFOR is currently retraining members of the KLA to form the Kosovo Protection Corps (KPC).[82] The mission got off to a rocky start, with returning Kosovar Albanians reportedly killing or kidnapping hundreds of Serbs and Gypsies (the latter accused by the Albanians of having collaborated with the Serbs) and turning thousands more into refugees in the first two months after KFOR's arrival.[83] A survey conducted by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees a few months after KFOR entered Kosovo estimated

---

[78] Ibid, 227.

[79] Ibid, 228-9.

[80] Wesley Clark, Waging Modern War: Bosnia, Kosovo, and the Future of Combat (New York: Public Affairs, 2001) 176.

[81] Michael Mandelbaum, "A Perfect Failure: NATO's War Against Yugoslavia," Foreign Affairs 78.5 (September/October 1999) <http://firstsearch.oclc.org/WebZ/FSPage?pagename=tempftascii:pagetype=print:

entityprinting=> 2-8.

[82] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO's Role in Relation to Kosovo . 9 August 2000. 31 October 2001. <http://www.nato.int/docu/facts/2000/kosovo.htm>.

[83] Doug Bandow. "NATO's Hypocritical Humanitarianism." NATO's Empty Victory: A Postmortem on the Balkan War, ed. Ted Galen Carpenter (Washington, D.C.: Cato Institute, 2000) 39-40.

the Kosovo Serb population as only 70,000, approximately a third of the total before the NATO bombing.[84] While tensions between the ethnic Serb and ethnic Albanian populations remain high and a cause for concern, NATO does claim some successes: the original murder rate of fifty per week is down to four; several multi-ethnic police classes have graduated; the 28 October 2001 elections went relatively smoothly; and repairs are being made around the province.[85]

Three years after the intervention, KFOR troops have found their job limited mostly to searching for and disposing of unauthorized munitions, foiling illegal border crossings, overseeing peaceful demonstrations, and conducting various acts of assistance. However, recent incidents demonstrate that not all residents are resigned to peaceful coexistence. Two French KFOR members were wounded in a hand grenade attack in December 2001. In January 2002, the arrest of a Serb militant in Kosovska Mitrovica by KFOR—after bystanders foiled an earlier attempt—led to rioting by mobs that attacked UN police officers.[86] In April 2002, the same city was again the scene of violence. KFOR troops fired tear gas and stun grenades into a rioting crowd of hundreds of Kosovo Serbs after UN police arrested another Serb militant.[87] The next day in Mitrovica, a crowd of over 500 people began stoning a UN police patrol. The situation worsened when the police arrested the man that appeared to be orchestrating the riot; two grenades were thrown at the police and gunshots were exchanged. KFOR troops were deployed to the area at the request of the UN police.[88] These incidents have apparently been both rare enough and not recent enough to allow NATO to agree to reductions in the number of

---

84 "Kosovo Resurgent," Economist (25 September 1999), <http://www.economist.com/PrinterFriendly.cfm?Story_ID= >. NATO did not agree with the results of the survey, believing the number of Serbs in Kosovo to be higher.

85 North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Kosovo - Facts and Figures. 5 December 2000. 31 October 2001. <http://www.nato.int/docu/facts/2000/kosovo-ff.htm>. Items being repaired include houses, bridges, roads, railways, and electrical grids.

86 CNN.com, "U.N. Police Stoned in Kosovo," 7 January 2002, <http://www.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/Europe/01/07/kosovo.mob/index.html>.

87 NJ.com, "Shots, Grenade Blasts as Serbs Clash With NATO Troops in Kosovo," 8 April 2002, <http://www.nj.com/newsflash/international/index.sf?/cgi-free/getstory_ssf.chi?a0558_BC_Kosovo-Clash&&news&newsflash-international>.

88 North Atlantic Treaty Organization. KFOR Press Release; Daily News Update. 9 April 2002. 17 April 2002. <http://www.nato.int/kfor/press/pr/pr/2002/04/12-04.htm>.

troops stationed in Kosovo—although the exact form the restructuring will take and the date of completion has not yet been agreed upon—from the current 38,000 to 33,200.[89]

D. LESSONS TO BE LEARNED

Negotiations regarding Kosovo showed the same weaknesses as were evident regarding Bosnia, and this time they had a greater effect. Not dealing with the KLA gave the guerrillas an opportunity to restart the fighting on their terms and thereby force NATO to act. Rambouillet was an attempt to force two unwilling parties, and only one gave in. One of the great "what if's" of the negotiations is whether Milosevic would have signed at Rambouillet had he been offered the same deal he was at the end of Operation Allied Force. Many have argued that the negotiators can not claim to have "gone the extra mile," as U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright asserted, if the deal offered Milosevic after the bombing conceded more than the original.[90]

Perhaps the most important lesson from the Kosovo campaign is that military operations must be conducted in a way that meets the stated mission objectives. The objective in Kosovo was to prevent a worsening of the humanitarian disaster taking place.[91] However, General Wesley Clark, Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR), informed Albright before Operation Allied Force began that stopping the Serbs from targeting the Kosovar Albanians was not possible.[92] Regardless, the intervention went forward as planned, and in the eleven weeks of the bombing campaign, approximately four times as many people died in Kosovo than had during the period from when the fighting started in 1996 until the beginning of the air campaign. Two hundred and thirty thousand people had been displaced before the bombing started; after it was

---

[89] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. KFOR Press Release; Statement to the Press—KFOR Restructuring. 13 May 2002. <http://www.nato.int/kfor/press/pr/pr/2002/05/15-05.htm>, and CNN.com, "NATO to Cut Balkans Peacekeepers".

[90] Albright quoted in Mandelbaum, 4.

[91] Ibid, 233.

[92] Clark, 171. In a U.S. after action report, the joint statement by Secretary of Defense William Cohen and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Henry Shelton stated that NATO "knew that the use of military force could not stop Milosevic's attack on Kosovar civilians, which had been planned in advance and already was in the process of being carried out. The specific military objectives we set were to attack his ability to wage combat operations in the future against either Kosovo or Serbia's neighbors." However, later in the same report the objectives for Operation Allied Force are laid out, including, "Deter Milosevic from continuing and escalating his attacks in helpless civilians." See United States Department of Defense, Joint Statement on the Kosovo After Action Review (14 October 1999), <http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Oct1999/b10141999_bt478-99.html>.

over, the number was 1.4 million.[93] Whether this was the result of a planned assault—the rumored "Operation Horseshoe"—on the part of the Serbs is not the issue; the fact that NATO failed to meet its objectives with disastrous results is.[94]

The complete dichotomy of the Serbian actions and the NATO response is best demonstrated in a passage in the U.S. after action report:

> Milosevic was unable to challenge superior allied military capabilities directly. Therefore, he chose to fight chiefly through indirect means: use of terror tactics against Kosovar civilians; attempts to exploit the premium the alliance placed on minimizing civilian casualties and collateral damage; creation of enormous refugee flows to create a humanitarian crisis…Milosevic's military forces were forced into hiding throughout most of the campaign, staying in caves and tunnels and under the cover of forest, village, or weather…He chose his tactics in the hope of exploiting our legitimate political concerns about target selection, collateral damage, and conducting military operations against enemy forces intermingled with civilian refugees.[95]

The above statement completely misses the key point about Operation Allied Force: NATO needed to stop the Serbian forces in order to complete its mission, not the other way around. The answer to why NATO did not is comprised of two parts: first, how the bombing campaign was conducted; second, the unwillingness to employ ground troops to do what the bombing campaign could not.

NATO's targeting choices during the air campaign offer lessons both as far as the Alliance and the indigenous population are concerned. The targets had to be cleared through the political chains of command, but this proved both contentious—some allies wanted different priorities while others tried to protect certain interests—and possibly risky to security, in light of the exposure of a leak reportedly created by a French official.[96] However, mechanisms were developed to allow for the delegation of target approval authority for certain targets to the military commanders.[97] The difficulty in

---

[93] Mandelbaum.

[94] Judah, 240.

[95] United States Department of Defense, Joint Statement on the Kosovo After Action Review.

[96] Clark, 175-6, 224, 236.

[97] Defenselink.mil. Alliance and Coalition Warfare. 19 February 2002. <http://www.defenselink.mil/specials/lessons/acw.html>. Targets for which approval were not delegated included, for example, those located in Belgrade or likely to involve high amounts of collateral damage.

hitting targets such as mobile troops in Kosovo has already been mentioned, but there is another aspect—striking targets such as television stations, bridges, and electric power systems is effective on a strategic level.[98] However, destroying these targets results in the suffering of innocent civilians and potentially even civilian casualties. Serbian public opinion coalesced largely as a result of the impression that the Serbs were NATO's true target. Owing to the scarcity of exclusively military targets, about sixty percent of the targets attacked were dual-use (civilian and military).[99] Inevitable mistakes resulted in 500-2,000 killed and 6,000 wounded.[100]

The reluctance of most Allies to employ troops on the ground in Kosovo contributed to difficulties in conducting NATO's stated mission. While NATO was destroying bridges and ammunition depots, Serb forces continued their "ethnic cleansing" in Kosovo. The bombing of strategic targets may have affected Milosevic's ability to conduct military operations in the long run, but he was not operating in the long run. Only targeting the troops involved in actual operations in Kosovo would have stopped those troops from conducting their "ethnic cleansing;" as that was extremely difficult from the air (especially at an altitude of 15,000 feet), the only other option was to do it from the ground. In fact, there was speculation that if the Allies had even appeared willing to put troops on the ground, Milosevic might have been deterred from deploying his forces in the first place.[101] Unfortunately, announcements like the one made by President Clinton in March 1999 that "I don't intend to put our troops in Kosovo to fight a war" made it clear to Milosevic that he did not need to even spare troops to defend the borders of Serbia.[102]

See United States Department of Defense, Joint Statement on the Kosovo After Action Review.

[98] Ibid, 242.

[99] Judah, 238-9, 256-7.

[100] Ibid, 264. However, these incidents of collateral damage amounted to "an incident rate of less than one-tenth of one percent," according to General Wesley Clark, SACEUR, in charge of Operation Allied Force. See Defenselink.mil, "Air Chief's Kosovo Lesson: Go for Snake's Head First," 19 February 2002. <http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Oct1999/n10261999_9910264.html>.

[101] "Kosovo, Continued," Economist (20 May 1999), <http://www.economist.com/PrinterFriendly.cfm?Story_ID=205834>.

[102] Clinton quoted in Carl Cavanagh Hodge, "Casual War: NATO's Intervention in Kosovo," Ethics and International Affairs (2000), 46.

NATO proved to be completely unprepared for the number of refugees created during the air campaign. When the refugees began to pour in to FYROM, Albania, Montenegro, and Bosnia-Herzegovina, the supplies to house and feed them were not on hand, despite earlier insistence that the Allies were prepared for Serbian actions.[103] NATO documented many resources found to be important but lacking: linguists, engineering assets for emergency repairs of roads and bridges, detailed maps, and prepositioned aid supplies such as tents and water.[104] In a historical overview of NATO's intervention, the Alliance trumpeted its contribution to the refugee effort, pointing out that it provided equipment and built camps for 50,000 refugees in Albania—a number that pales in comparison with the 430,000 refugees that had reached Albania by the end of May 1999. The NATO humanitarian aid mission was impressive once it got underway, transporting over 4,500 tons of food and water and nearly 1,600 tons of medical gear.[105] However, had the Alliance been as prepared as it claimed to have been, there would not have been a delay of several days to get the humanitarian aid portion of its "humanitarian intervention" operative.

Lastly, just as in Bosnia, NATO failed to act preventively to keep the conflict from worsening. Western leaders in 1998 toughened up their rhetoric to Milosevic to demonstrate they that had learned the lesson of Bosnia, but no action was taken even though some diplomats had been pushing for NATO to devote attention to the impending conflict for over a year.[106] Prevention is difficult, partly because it demands that governments turn their attention away from current problems to potential problems. By postponing action in the Kosovo conflict, NATO again found itself in a situation not of its making, a crisis in which it was forced to take military action on someone else's terms. The Balkan crises have shown that more forward thinking is essential.[107]

---

[103] Jane Perlez, "State Department Faults U.S. Aid for War Refugees as Inept," New York Times, 9 May 2000: A8.

[104] Defenselink.mil. Other Lessons Learned. 19 February 2002. <http://www.defenselink.mil/specials/lessons/other.html>.

[105] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO's Role in Relation to the Conflict in Kosovo. 15 July 1999. <http://www.nato.int/kosovo/history.htm>.

[106] Ibid, 119, 150. Secretary of Defense William Perry specifically stated that the need to intervene earlier in a conflict was a lesson learned from Bosnia-Herzegovina. See Elaine Sciolino, "Bosnia Policy Shaped by U.S. Military Role," New York Times, 29 July 1996: A15.

[107] Zimmermann, 241.

V. NATO IN THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

A. HISTORY OF THE CONFLICT

Even after the three-year war in Bosnia (1992-1995) and the influx of refugees in the wake of the Kosovo conflict (1998-1999), FYROM appeared to be avoiding similar ethnic fighting. This illusion was shattered in February 2001 with the appearance of the National Liberation Army (NLA). The NLA claimed to be comprised of "freedom fighters" along the lines of the KLA, fighting for greater rights for the ethnic Albanian minority in FYROM. The government accused them of being terrorists—and in some cases former KLA members—and refused to negotiate at the barrel of the gun. Sporadic fighting broke out from February 2001 until a Western-brokered cease-fire on 5 July 2001 offered an opportunity to search for a political settlement to the conflict.[108] During the search for a cease-fire and afterwards, NATO's political leaders were heavily engaged in FYROM. The Secretary General and several other high level officials visited frequently and invited FYROM government officials to Brussels, and a civilian NATO representative was assigned to the country to provide coordination and foster communication between the government and NATO. A personal representative of the Secretary General was also assigned to FYROM to help broker the cease-fire.[109]

An enduring cease-fire was one of four steps required of the two sides before a NATO deployment to the country to aid in disarming the rebel NLA. The other three were a general political agreement among the main political parties, a disarmament plan agreed upon by the rebels and the government, and an agreement between NATO and the FYROM government on NATO forces entering the country to conduct their mission.[110] As the political parties worked on the outlines of a Western-backed peace plan, NATO developed the plan for Operation Essential Harvest. At the same time, in order to

[108] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Joint Statement on the ceasefires in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia . 5 July 2001. 17 October 2001. <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-101e.htm>.

[109] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Facts and Figures - the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. 17 August 2001. 16 October 2001.<http://www.nato.int/docu/facts/2001/ff-macedonia.htm>.

[110] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Facts and Figures - the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

increase the stability of FYROM, KFOR increased border patrols, seizing over 3,000 weapons, 73,000 rounds of ammunition, and 385 illegal border crossers in a month and a half. KFOR also shared intelligence and surveillance information with FYROM authorities, as well as providing a tactical liaison team to the FYROM forces.[111]

Despite intermittent bursts of violence, the cease-fire held in general. On 13 August 2001 the FYROM political leaders signed a peace deal that granted much-sought rights to the ethnic Albanian minority, such as recognition of Albanian as a second official language, more local control, and greater representation in the police force. In return, the ethnic Albanian minority recognized the inviolability of FYROM's borders. Although the NLA was not a signatory to the deal, it pledged to abide by it and to disarm pending an offer of amnesty and indications that the constitutional reforms were being carried out.[112]

B. NATO'S INTERVENTION

On 22 August 2001, Operation Essential Harvest was launched with 3,500 troops and a thirty-day mandate to disarm the NLA.[113] Task Force Harvest had three key tasks: collection of weapons and ammunition from the NLA; transportation and disposal of the weapons; and transportation and destruction of the ammunition.[114] Almost immediately, the NATO operation faced its most serious challenge: the death of a British soldier, Sapper Ian Collins. Some had wondered if NATO would continue with the operation in the face of any Alliance fatalities, and the Alliance answered those concerns by carrying on with its mission. For the first time the U.S. provided no combat troops, only logistics and medical support.[115] There were snags with the collection process, mostly centered

---

111 Ibid. KFOR launched an official mission, Operation EAGLE, specifically to interdict logistical support to the NLA from Kosovo and to keep the NLA from using Kosovo as a base. The number of companies located on the border was increased from eleven to twenty, focused solely on border operations.

112 Alissa J. Rubin, "Macedonia's Leaders Sign Deal Paving Way for Peace," Los Angeles Times 14 August 2001: A1.

113 North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Operation Essential Harvest. 1 October 2001. 17 October 2001. <http://www.nato.int/fyrom/tfh/home.htm/>.

114 North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Task Force Harvest Mission. 17 October 2001. <http://www.afsouth.nato.int/operations/skopje/harvest.htm>.

115 North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Task Force Harvest Mission. Infantry forces were supplied by Canada, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, The Netherlands, Spain, Turkey, and the United Kingdom; a transport company by Belgium; EOD forces by Hungary, Norway, and Portugal; military police by Italy; and MEDEVAC units and air transport by Italy and the United States. This list

on the intransigence of some members of the FYROM parliament. Weapons collection occurred in three stages, and the government needed to show good faith by meeting certain requirements on the road to reform of the constitution. There was also much rancorous disagreement on the number and type of weapons collected by NATO. The operation's goal was to collect 3,300 weapons, while the government estimated that the NLA held from 8,000 to 85,000.[116] The government also objected to the unusable condition of some of the weapons that were accepted by NATO troops in Task Force Harvest and counted against the total. However, by 25 September 2001, NATO had collected 3,381 weapons and declared its mission accomplished.[117]

C. THE END STATE

However, there was much concern both within and outside FYROM that the peace simply would not hold without a guarantor. Monitors were being dispatched to the state to verify the implementation of the peace plan, but Bosnia had shown how ineffective unarmed or lightly armed monitors could be. Those operating in Kosovo had their security provided by KFOR, but there was no such force envisioned for FYROM. The government formally requested one, and NATO developed Operation Amber Fox in response. Task Force Fox was activated on 26 September 2001 to assist in protecting the international monitors. The initial mandate was for three months, with the option to prolong depending on the situation in FYROM.[118] Operation Amber Fox has been extended three times, for three months the first two times and for four months in the most recent extension; the current expiration date for the operation is 26 October 2002.[119]

---

covers the initial forces of Task Force Fox, and is not all-inclusive, however; every NATO member has in fact taken part.

[116] Peter Finn, "Macedonians Suspicious of Peace Plan; NATO to Collect Arms as Disputes Continue," Washington Post 27 August 2001: A12.

[117] "Macedonia Acts on Constitution; Balkans: Changes to Boost Albanian Rights are Approved But Still Require Ratification," Los Angeles Times 25 September 2001: A19.

[118] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Operation Amber Fox. 12 October 2001. 17 October 2001. <http://www.nato.int/fyrom/tff/home.htm>.

[119] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO Extends Its Mandate in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. 22 May 2002. <http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2002/0520/e0521a.htm>. Germany will continue to command the mission until June 2002, when they will be relieved by the Netherlands.

Task Force Fox consists of 700 troops that can be supplemented with 300 troops already in country if necessary.[120]

The last serious incident that apparently occurred between two groups of different ethnicities in FYROM was a small battle in the town of Mala Recica on 25 March 2002. Gunfire and grenades were exchanged; the Task Force Fox patrol in the area called for additional support teams to monitor the situation and counter any threat to the international observers in the area. The next morning the troops entered the town and verified two dead and three injured. The Albanian National Army (ANA) claimed responsibility for one group.[121] The ANA emerged in November 2001, claiming to fight for "the liberation of all Albanian territories in former Yugoslavia," despite a membership that totaled only about fifty.[122] However, the ANA has not been much heard from since, and the most severe problem encountered by the monitors in the field since has been the occasional protest roadblock.[123] Another gun battle took place on 4 April 2002, possibly a continuation of fighting from the week before that left two dead; but this time it was probably between rival guerrilla factions.[124] At the same time, the government has continued, albeit slowly at times, to carry out its part of the deal. Two key laws in the peace plan, the self-government law and the full amnesty law, were passed on 25 January and 8 March 2002, respectively.[125]

D. LESSONS BEING LEARNED

Of the potential lessons identified in this thesis, some appear to have been applied in the operations in FYROM, though not all. However, by far the most important—not

---

120 North Atlantic Treat Organization. Task Force Fox. 17 October 2001. <http://www.afsouth.nato.int/operations/skopje2/FOX.htm>.

121 North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Press Briefing Held on 27 March 2002. 4 April 2002. 14 May 2002. <http://www.afsouth.nato.int/operations/skopje/TRANSCRIPT-27mar.htm>.

122 CNN.com, "Fresh Clashes in Macedonia," 17 November 2001, <http://www.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/europe/11/17/macedonia.clashes/index.html>.

123 North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Press Briefing Held on 24 April 2002. 14 May 2002. <http://www.afsouth.nato.int/operations/skopje/TRANSCRIPT-24apr.htm>.

124 CNN.com, "New Gun Battle in Macedonia," 4 April 2002, <http://www.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/europe/04/04/macedonia.clash/index.html>.

125 CNN.com, "Macedonia Passed Peace Deal Law," 25 January 2002, <http://www.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/europe/01/25/macedonia.parliament/index.html?related> and CNN.com, "Amnesty Law Brings Peace Hope," 8 March 2002, <http://www.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/europe/03/08/macedonia.amnesty/index.html>.

least because it nullifies many of the rest—was the need to intervene early in a crisis. This clearly took place in FYROM. Although NATO did not become involved until after violence had broken out, it was still at a low and manageable level. The population, military, and police had not yet reached the point of no return where only a military solution was feasible. In fact, before conducting Operation Essential Harvest, NATO stated firmly that there was "no military solution to the present crisis."[126] From the beginning of the crisis, NATO was heavily involved both politically and—using the forces in KFOR across the border—militarily. As a result, the question of how to conduct a combat operation never came up. Early involvement also allowed NATO to intervene on its own terms, in contrast with the previous two operations.

Caution must be exercised in comparing the intervention in FYROM with those in the Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo conflicts. It is difficult to say what the outcome would have been in either of the latter had intervention been undertaken earlier. However, a key difference in FYROM as compared to Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo is that both sides welcomed NATO's intervention. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the government was willing to see an intervention; the Bosnian Serbs were not. In Kosovo, the Kosovar Albanians were hoping that NATO or other international forces would intervene, but the Serbian government that ruled the province was not open to a deployment of any international forces. Perhaps earlier intervention in the Kosovo conflict, and intervention of a more political nature, would have made the need to deploy international forces moot, perhaps not. In any case, the interventions in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo were of a different sort than the one in FYROM. NATO must be prepared for both types of crisis management operations.

The parties themselves conducted most of the negotiations in this crisis. The peace plan, although backed by Western powers, was not imposed upon either side. This left the responsibility for finding a middle ground up to those involved, and, one may hope, this will result in terms more acceptable to the population. It also gives both parties greater incentives to work through to a solution than would a settlement imposed from the outside. A poll in late August 2001 found 50.3% in favor of the constitutional

[126] North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Facts and Figures - the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

reforms.[127] Although, once again, one of the parties was left out of the negotiations—in this case, the NLA, much as the KLA had been absent from the Rambouillet negotiations—this time that party agreed to abide by the peace plan as if it was a signatory.

Although the jury is still out on the overall success of Operations Essential Harvest and Amber Fox, U.S. leadership appears to have been unnecessary in this case. The British commanded Task Force Harvest; the Germans command Task Force Fox and will be relieved by the Dutch in June 2002. American participation has been minimal. Observers in both NATO and EU countries have asked whether it is time for the EU to step in and begin dealing with such crises with its own military capabilities. Such a move is certainly not imminent, as it would require an asset sharing agreement between NATO and the EU to be finalized. The governments of some Allies also disagree with the implied division of labor, due to potential effects on the relationship with the United States.[128] However, as far as NATO is concerned, Task Force Harvest and Task Force Fox have shown that interventions not requiring combat, at least, can be undertaken without either U.S. leadership or U.S. forces.

The one lesson, unfortunately, that NATO does not yet appear to have embraced is the need for a long-term presence when dealing with deeply engrained ethnic conflicts. While IFOR accomplished its assigned mission, it was so narrowly defined that it made little difference to the stability of Bosnia. Both SFOR and KFOR are open-ended, in recognition of the long-term commitment needed in those countries. Task Force Fox's mandate has come up for review twice; twice it has been extended at the request of the FYROM government, but each time only for an additional three months. Admitting the need for an out-of-area mission of indefinite duration in the Balkans is problematic for many NATO member states. However, the setting of firm exit dates rather than goals to determine mission accomplishment runs the risk of undoing all the good that the initial intervention was meant to do.

---

[127] Peter Finn, "Worried Macedonians Weigh Public Vote on Peace Accord; Officials Fear Legislative Rejections of Pact, Seek Alternative," The Washington Post 30 August 2001: A26.

[128] CNN.com, "NATO to Cut Balkans Peacekeepers" and David Charter, "Defense Plans Threaten NATO, Say Tories" 15 May 2002, < http://ebird.dtic.mil/May2002/e20020515defence.htm>.

VI. CONCLUSION

NATO today is in many ways far removed from the NATO of the beginning of the 1990s, and even further from the NATO of the Cold War. The Strategic Concepts issued in 1991 and 1999 are strong indicators of the change in the Alliance, because they are public—rather than classified—documents, with a higher focus on political goals than military operations. Both combined collective defense with the need to promote stability and security throughout Europe, including through selective crisis management interventions.[129] The Alliance now has nearly a decade of experience in crisis management operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the FRY, and FYROM. However, the most recent Strategic Concept, published in 1999, does not hold many differences from the 1991 version as far as crisis management operations are concerned. The 2001 *NATO Handbook* is based on the 1999 Strategic Concept. Neither of these recent articulations of policy appears to capture many of the lessons that should have been learned from operations in the Balkans.

As in the 1999 Strategic Concept, the *NATO Handbook* identifies crisis management as a fundamental task of the Alliance "in order to enhance the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area." The three elements of NATO's crisis management policy are "dialogue, cooperation with other countries, and the maintenance of NATO's collective defense capability."[130] While partnership with non-NATO nations is part of the fundamental task of promoting stability in Europe, it is also a key aspect of crisis management. Partnership is viewed as a way both to avoid future conflicts and to bring many states together, if necessary, in crisis management activities.[131] NATO has established a political structure to handle the decision-making and consensus building required by crisis management operations.[132] A military structure including immediate and rapid reaction forces—land, sea, and air—ready at short notice for crisis response has

---

[129] North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO Handbook (Brussels, Belgium: NATO Office of Information and Press, 2001) 44.

[130] NATO Handbook, 155.

[131] NATO Handbook, 74, 78.

[132] NATO Handbook, 224-7, 231.

also been organized.[133] Lastly, the *NATO Handbook* acknowledges the Alliance's need for links with other security institutions, specifically the UN, the OSCE, the EU, the WEU, and the Council of Europe for a "wider institutional framework for security."[134] NATO has worked closely with the first three institutions in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the FRY, and FYROM.[135]

However, the focus in the *NATO Handbook* still appears too narrow to cover even the operations that NATO is currently conducting in the Balkans. According to the *NATO Handbook*, "in the event of crises which might lead to a military threat to the security of the Alliance members, NATO forces must…contribute to the management of such crises and to their peaceful resolution."[136] None of the crises in the Balkans fits this narrow interpretation of a crisis that requires NATO intervention, as none had the potential to result in a military threat to the security of any NATO member state. The *NATO Handbook* includes a section that specifically addresses military operations as part of crisis management:

> Moreover, as in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo, where NATO forces are currently deployed, future Alliance military operations are likely to be markedly different from the kind of operation for which planning was undertaken during the Cold War. They will probably take place outside Alliance territory; they may last for many years; and they will involve troops of many nations working closely together--principally from member states but also, in some instances, from Partner countries. Moreover, crisis management tasks demand different skills from those required for fighting wars.[137]

This statement fails to acknowledge, however, that some crisis management operations are not that different from fighting wars—Operations Deliberate Force and Allied Force are two recent examples. The references to operations that can last for years

---

[133] NATO Handbook, 258.

[134] NATO Handbook, 339-70.

[135] NATO worked closely with the WEU in embargo enforcement in the early 1990s. The WEU was expected to serve as the vehicle for European Security and Defense Identity until late 1998, when changes in British policy led to the EU's pursuit of a European Security and Defense Policy. The EU summit in June 1999 approved plans for the EU to absorb the WEU's institutional functions in 2000-2001; and these plans have been carried out.

[136] NATO Handbook, 49.

[137] NATO Handbook, 51.

and involve partners**,** including those in Partnership for Peace and the Mediterranean Dialogue, appear to address only SFOR and KFOR. This is a key omission in NATO's crisis management doctrine as delineated in the *NATO Handbook*. Despite the military organization and structure sections, and despite the reference to active crisis management, the handbook is mostly dedicated to the conflict prevention form of crisis management: dialogue and cooperation with partner states. However, two of NATO's three interventions in the Balkans were undertaken after dialogue and cooperation had failed—where it had been attempted—and where combat operations were needed to impose order and reach a point where there was a peace to keep.

Only the intervention in FYROM has followed the pattern of a crisis management operation in which conflict prevention was all that was required. It met many of the conditions the Alliance outlined in both the 1999 Strategic Concept and the *NATO Handbook*. Intervention occurred early in the crisis, before military forces were required to fight for a peace rather than keep one. The intervention started with intense dialogue that recognized the concerns of both sides and allowed them to negotiate with each other, rather than attempting to impose a settlement unacceptable to one or both parties. The need to intervene in FYROM was accepted much more easily than in either Bosnia-Herzegovina or the FRY. However, this intervention is not being conducted in accordance with the passage from the *NATO Handbook* quoted above, in which operations that "may last for many years" are foreseen. With that exception, Operations Essential Harvest and Amber Fox are consistent with a crisis management doctrine that covers all necessary aspects.

The interventions in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the FRY, however, require a doctrine that is not contained in the *NATO Handbook*. Moreover, the way in which they were conducted was not in line with the doctrine as published. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, NATO had very little dialogue with the parties involved, especially as NATO officials refused to deal with the leaders of one of those parties, the Bosnian Serbs. Additionally, in both cases intervention was delayed until NATO felt it had to act.

Relations between the Alliance and other international security institutions, notably the UN in the Bosnian case, were strained during the combat military operations;

they have, however, been successful for SFOR and KFOR activities. SFOR and KFOR operations are likely to continue, albeit at a much reduced level from when they began, for years to come.

In the Kosovo conflict, NATO made many of the same mistakes as in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Dialogue, such as it was, did not initially involve all parties. Negotiations, especially those at Rambouillet, were in name only, because NATO was attempting to impose a settlement on both the Serbs and the KLA. Intervention was again delayed until NATO's options were limited to combat operations. Those operations were complicated by the Alliance's decision to conduct only a bombing campaign, and that with various force protection measures that made it difficult to interfere with the Serb police, military, and paramilitary actions underway on the ground. This operation was thus unable to meet the objectives laid out by NATO before the commencement of Operation Allied Force—above all, to stop Milosevic from carrying out his "ethnic cleansing." The air campaign concentrated largely on strategic rather than tactical targets, allowing the Serbian forces in Kosovo to create a refugee flow for which NATO was unprepared.

Since combat operations have clearly been part of NATO crisis management operations in the past, the Alliance's crisis management doctrine and key policy articulations such as the Strategic Concept should anticipate them in the future. As noted earlier, a key difference between the interventions in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the FRY, and the intervention in FYROM is that the latter involved two sides willing to work with NATO. That was not the case in Bosnia-Herzegovina or the FRY. The Alliance's doctrine should therefore acknowledge that early intervention with dialogue and cooperation will not be enough to manage every crisis. In some cases, NATO must be prepared to conduct "peacemaking" operations in accordance with the lessons learned from previous crisis management operations and thereby create a situation in which peacekeeping and eventual political reconciliation are possible.

NATO's crisis management doctrine must emphasize the importance of negotiations with all parties involved in a conflict, with due regard for their concerns. When NATO is co-operating with other security institutions, clear and acceptable chains of command must be worked out in advance, to avoid difficulties such as the NATO-UN

disagreements seen in Bosnia-Herzegovina before Operation Deliberate Force. When the Alliance determines that a combat mission is required to manage a crisis, that mission must be designed to complete the desired objectives. Specifically, the possible need for ground combat during an intervention must be acknowledged. Although strategic bombing at high altitudes with high levels of force protection is less dangerous to NATO forces and therefore less politically sensitive than ground combat, Operation Allied Force demonstrated that it is not always an effective means to meet the objectives of the mission. Finally, the Allies must demonstrate through deeds that their commitment to the long haul in crisis management is more than just words on the page.

As NATO and Russia sign agreements bringing them closer together, the need for collective defense in the Cold War sense of the concept seems ever less likely. However, sources of potential instability in eastern and central Europe persist over a decade after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. NATO continues to play a key role in bringing stability and security to all of Europe through its Partnership for Peace, Membership Action Plan, and the conduct of crisis management operations in the Balkans. NATO remains the only security institution in Europe equipped to deal effectively with crises such as those seen in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the FRY, and FYROM.[138] The Alliance has shown itself adept at peacekeeping in SFOR, KFOR, and Operations Essential Harvest and Amber Fox. At the same time, Operations Deliberate Force and Allied Force have demonstrated that combat operations outside NATO territory will also be part of crisis management, if dialogue and cooperation fail.

[138] It should be noted, however, that the European Union intends to develop capabilities to perform at least some crisis management tasks.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
   Ft. Belvoir, Virginia

2. Dudley Knox Library
   Naval Postgraduate School
   Monterey, California

3. David S. Yost
   Naval Postgraduate School
   Monterey, California

4. Tjarck Roessler
   Naval Postgraduate School
   Monterey, California

5. Stephen A. Garrett
   Naval Postgraduate School
   Monterey, California

6. Karen Guttieri
   Naval Postgraduate School
   Monterey, California

7. Commander Susan Fink, USN
   Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
   Medford, Massachusetts

8. Nicholas Williams
   Ministry of Defence
   Paris, France